DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 814 JC 750 170

AUTHOR Allison, Robert; And Others
TITLE An Assessment of Two Years of Faculty Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Bakersfield Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Teachers; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; Self Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Bakersfield College

ABSTRACT

A survey instrument was designed to ascertain faculty opinion on the faculty evaluation process so that the Academic Senate could make recommendations for future changes. Under the present system faculty must be evaluated every two years, but, within certain guidelines, departmental procedures may vary. A total of 77.3 percent of all faculty and administrators responded. Analysis of the data revealed the following: (1) the purpose of evaluation for regular (tenured) staff should be for the improvement of instruction; for contract (nontenured) staff the question of retention or dismissal should also be considered (present procedures treat regular and contract staff equally); (2) most faculty find evaluation moderately effective and beneficial and not threatening; (3) many faculty members seem to spend more time and receive more benefits from participating in the evaluation of others than themselves; (4) most faculty feel that the department chairman should be actively involved in evaluation; (5) a large number of faculty did not receive copies of their evaluations, although they should have; (6) over 85 percent of the respondents did not think that Bakersfield College should "try to do a complete and effective evaluation job, substantially exceeding legal requirements"; and (7) over 80 percent want to continue the present plan with minor modifications. The questionnaire, cover letters, tabulated responses, and additional faculty comments are presented. (DC)

ED101814

AN ASSESSMENT OF TWO YEARS OF FACULTY EVALUATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Robert Allison
Gregory Goodwin
Faculty Evaluation Committee

David C. Scott
Office of Institutional Research

February, 1975

JC 750 170

Introduction

In the pages that follow are the results of the evaluation survey conducted in the Fall 1974 jointly by the Bakersfield College Academic Senate Evaluation Committee and the Office of Institutional Research.

The contents of this report include the following:

Part I - A brief description of the procedures used to gather the data and written comments.

Part II - A copy of the questionnaire.

Part III - The all-college results of the responses to the questionnaire. This is subdivided into the following:

A. An explanation of how to interpret the data.

B. An analysis of the results by the Evaluation Committee.

C. The actual numbers and percentage responses to each item in the instrument.

D. A further numerical analysis of the written responses to items concerning the type of evaluation scheme used.

Part IV - An analysis of the written responses by the Evaluation Committee. Those actually desiring a copy of the thirteen pages of written responses may pick it up in Dave Scott's office.

Part V - Conclusion.

PART I

PROCEDURES TO GATHER DATA

The evaluation questionnaire which follows in Part II was developed during the summer of 1974 by Bob Allison, and was revised by the Office of Institutional Research incorporating suggestions by Greg Goodwin and members of the Office of Instruction.

The study was undertaken in response to the following recommendation of the accrediting team which visited Bakersfield College, November 14-16, 1972:

> "Instructor evaluation procedures differ not only from department to department, but also from individual to individual within the department. Immediate consideration should be given to the development of a reasonably uniform evaluation process in accordance with current legislation and some pattern is needed for evaluation of part-time faculty."

The instrument was drawn up using guidelines established by an Evaluation Committee which was appointed by Faculty Association President Dave Willard, and approved by the Academic Senate. This committee was composed of:

Greg Goodwin, Chairman
Bob Allison
Bob Gilmore
Ed Hageman
Arleen Hashim
Sally Hill
Joe Newton
Don Stansbury
Rod Wessman

As explained in the cover letter to the faculty which is enclosed with the questionnaire, the basic purpose of the survey was to ascertain the opinions of the faculty on the two-year evaluation process so that the Academic Senate could make recommendations for the evaluation process to be used in the future.

The instrument was sent through the campus mail to all faculty and administrators (263) at the college on August 27. It was later decided

to eliminate from the returns, responses of new faculty members since they had not experienced the evaluation process. The questionnaire and response card, to be marked with an electrographic pencil, were sent out with a return envelope addressed to the Office of Institutional Research. The respondent's name was on the envelope also in order that his or her name could be checked off the mailing list. The card and written comments were then removed from the envelope and it was destroyed to preserve anonymity. On September 10, a reminder was sent to those who had not yet responded; and on September 20, a letter was sent to department chairpersons urging them to remind members of their department who had not yet responded, to do so.

Return of the instrument can be summarized as follows:

Date	Number Returned	% Returned of 263
August 27 (sent to faculty)		
August 30	84	31.9
September 5	114	43.4
September 10 (reminder to faculty)	126	47.9
September 16	161	61.2
September 20 (note to Department Chairpersons)	168	63.9
September 30	199	75.7
September 30 (Preliminary computer run, cards of 12 new faculty members plus 1 blank card pulled; base was thus reduced from 263 to 251.)	186	74.1
October 10 (final computer run)	194	77.3

	Number Returned	% Returned of 251
Administrators	13 of 21	61.9
Faculty	181 of 230	78.7

A preliminary run of the results was made on September 30. The committee began its analysis as a result of this computer run. The final computer run was made October 10. The process of excerpting and analyzing the written responses was begun October 1.

During the October 10 run, the responses were computed separately for each of the twenty-five departments and for the administrators. A copy of the responses of members of departments was sent to each department chairperson. Therefore, faculty members who wish to see how the responses of their department compared with the all-college responses should check with their department chairperson.

PART II

Copy of questionnaire and covering letter sent to all Faculty and Administrators on August 27, 1974 and copies of two reminder notices.

Bakersfield College founded 1913

August 27, 1974

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Dave Scott, Greg Goodwin, Bob Allison

The following questionnaire, developed by the Academic Senate Evaluation Committee, is designed to ascertain your thoughts on the evaluation process that occurred at Bakersfield College the last two years. If the college is to come up with an effective staff development plan, it is imperative that every faculty member respond to the enclosed instrument. Your name on the upper left hand corner of the enclosed envelope is for check-off purposes only; once your name is recorded as having responded, the envelope will be destroyed, so be frank with your response.

Please mark your responses with an electrographic pencil on the attached card. Note that though there are eight possible responses for each number on the card, the response numbering runs from 1 to 4 and A to D; thus, both numbers and letters are listed as possible responses on the questionnaire. For each question or item, mark only one response. The last question, No. 39, deals with evaluation for the next two year period; please devote time to responding to this question.

If you wish to comment on any of the questions, please do so on the enclosed sheets numbering your responses and return the sheets with the card in the enclosed envelope to Dave Scott.

Note that the actual questions begin with number 5 - the first 4 numbers on the card are for the purpose of indicating your department. Following is a code by which you designate your department on the card. If you are in more than one department, designate the department where you teach the majority of your courses.

DEPARTMENT CODING SYSTEM

If your department is in the list below, please mark the appropriate number or letter opposite the number 1 on the card:

1 - Administrative
2 - Agriculture
3 - Art
4 - Audio-Visual
A - Business Ed
B - Counseling
C - Drama
D - English

1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305 • tel: (805) 871-7120 • Kern Community College District

If your department is in the list below, please mark the appropriate number or letter opposite the number 2 on the card:

1 - Foreign Language
2 - Health and P.E.
3 - Health Sciences
4 - Home Ec
A - Industrial Education
B - Journalism
C - Library
D - Life Science

If your department is in the list below, please mark the appropriate number or letter opposite the number 3 on the card:

1 - Math
2 - Music
3 - Nursing R.N.
4 - Philosophy
A - Physical Science
B - Psychology
C - Public Service
D - Social Science

If your department is on the list below, please mark the appropriate number or letter opposite the number 4 on the card:

1 - Sociology - Anthropology - Geography
2 - Speech

ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

5) At the time of evaluation, were you regular staff (tenured) or contract (non-tenured)? (1) regular (2) contract

6) Were you evaluated at least once during the October 1972 - May 1974 period? (1) yes (2) no

If your response to question 6 was yes, please answer questions 7 through 39. If your response was no, please answer as many of the questions that you feel are applicable to you.

7) The general college plan encourages staff members to seek evaluation information from as many sources as appropriate; self, peer, student, administrative -- which of these types were required of you by your department? (1) no scheme specifically required to my knowledge (2) all four were required (3) self, administrative (4) peer, self, student (A) administrative, student (B) self, student (C) optional combination -- specify this option on the enclosed sheet (D) pattern not included in any of the above -- please specify on the enclosed sheet

8) What types of evaluation were actually used in your case? (1) not aware of scheme used in my case (2) all four were used (3) self, administrative (4) peer, self, student (A) administrative, student (B) self, student (C) optional combination -- specify the option actually selected on the enclosed sheet (D) pattern not included in any of the above -- please specify this pattern used on the enclosed sheet

9) What kind of evaluation do you consider most useful? (1) self (2) peer (3) student (4) administrative (A) other -- please specify

10) Was the evaluation procedure flexible, allowing for individual situations? (1) very flexible (2) flexible (3) structured (4) very structured

11) To what extent did you feel your evaluation procedure was too structured or flexible? (1) too flexible (2) about right balance between structure and flexibility (3) too structured

12) How time consuming was the evaluation process for you? (1) more than 10 hours (2) 8-10 hours (3) 6-8 hours (4) 4-6 hours (A) 2-4 hours (B) less than two hours

13) Do you feel that the time you spent on your evaluation was (1) excessive (2) about right (3) probably less than you should have

14) In your opinion, what should be the major purpose for evaluation of contract (non-tenured) staff? (1) mostly for improvement of instruction (2) partly for retention-dismissal purpose and partly for the improvement of instruction (3) mostly for retention-dismissal purpose (4) other -- please specify

15) In your opinion, what should be the major purpose of evaluation for regular (tenured) staff? (1) mostly for the improvement of instruction (2) partly for the improvement of instruction and partly a grading process (3) mostly a grading process (4) other -- please specify

16) In your opinion, to what extent was your evaluation an effective device for satisfying the major purpose as stated in item 15? (1) very effective (2) effective (3) moderately effective (4) of very little use (A) worthless

17) As you perceived it, what was the major purpose of your evaluation? (1) mostly for the improvement of instruction (2) partly for the improvement of instruction and partly a grading process (3) mostly a grading process (4) other -- please specify

18) In your opinion, to what extent was your evaluation an effective device in achieving its purpose as you perceived it in question 17? (1) very effective (2) effective (3) moderately effective (4) of little use (A) worthless

19) How was your evaluation beneficial to you in terms of your professional goals? (1) very beneficial (2) beneficial (3) neither beneficial nor detrimental (4) detrimental (A) very detrimental

20) Do you see evaluation as a threatening process? (1) very threatening (2) some threat (3) little threat (4) marginally threatening (A) not threatening at all

21) The Office of Instruction states the major purpose of evaluation at Bakersfield College "is to assist staff members in the continued development of their professional competencies". Did you perceive this as the basic purpose of your evaluation? (1) yes (2) no

22) To what extent should evaluation be tied to developmental activities such as taking courses, developing curricula, etc.? (1) should be considered the most important factor in evaluation (2) should be considered one of a number of essential factors in evaluation (3) should be considered an important but optional factor (4) should be considered an unimportant but possibly useful factor (A) should not be considered in evaluation

23) What actions, if any, have you taken to improve your performance as a result of your evaluation? (1) I have made major alterations in all aspects of my professional life (2) a large number (3) a fair number (4) very few (A) none

24) Have you been involved in the evaluation of any of your colleagues? (1) yes (2) no

If your answer to 24 was yes, please answer the following questions (25-28)

25) With how many faculty (non-administrative) evaluation(s) have you been involved? (1) one (2) two (3) three (4) four (A) more than four

26) How much total time did you personally spend on the evaluation of other faculty members? (1) more than 10 hours (2) 8-10 hours (3) 6-8 hours (4) 4-6 hours (A) 2-4 hours (B) less than 2 hours

27) To what extent do you see your participation in others' evaluation as being beneficial to <u>you</u>? (1) very beneficial (2) beneficial (3) neither beneficial nor detrimental (4) detrimental (A) very detrimental

28) To what extent do you see your participation in others' evaluations as being beneficial to the faculty member(s) being evaluated? (1) very beneficial (2) beneficial (3) neither beneficial nor detrimental (4) detrimental (A) very detrimental

29) This question applies to the overall college evaluation plan - the guidelines on which the department plans were based. The college plan allows for a variety of departmental plans within its general guidelines. Is this (1) too flexible? (2) slightly more flexible than you would prefer? (3) about right? (4) slightly more structured than you would prefer? (A) too structured?

Questions 30 through 34 refer to the sheet on which the evaluation results are summarized, the "Bakersfield College Report of Certificated Evaluation", a copy of which is attached. It has been suggested that the form is too unstructured and that more details as to what is to be reported be specified on the form.

30) Do you think (1) the form is fine as it is (2) the form needs revision

If you answered (2) to the previous question, answer the following indented questions (31-34)

31) Should the form include general headings such as "Participants in Evaluation" and "Standards Used for Evaluation"? (1) yes (2) no

32) The form should include statements of standards and evaluation participant groups (peer, self, etc.) with room for check marks to indicate standards used. (1) yes (2) no

33) The form should be a "multiple choice" sheet with little or no space for comments. (1) yes (2) no

34) Should changes other than those indicated be made? (1) yes (2) no If your response is (1), please specify.

35) The form provides space for "Evaluator(s)" to sign. Who should sign in this space? (1) chairman of evaluation committee only (2) all members of faculty evaluation committee (3) all members of faculty evaluation committee and the department chairman (4) department chairman only (A) other -- specify

36) What role should a department chairman have in evaluation? (1) No role except to sign the evaluation summary and send it to administration. He should not be the one to summarize evaluation materials. (2) He should summarize evaluation materials without further judgment, sign, and send the summary to administration. (3) He should summarize the evaluation materials, including a minimal amount of his own opinion in the final result. (4) He should make the summary of evaluation materials reflect both his own judgment of the evaluation results and his personal evaluation of the faculty member. (A) He should be actively involved in the evaluation of each faculty member in his department.

37) The college evaluation plan provides that you receive a copy of your evaluation summary signed by the president. Did you receive yours? (1) yes (2) no

38) There are many opinions on the extent to which Bakersfield College faculty should participate in evaluation. Do you feel (1) the faculty should try to do a complete and effective evaluation job, substantially exceeding legal requirements (2) the faculty should endeavor to do an effective job, possibly exceeding legal minimums (3) the faculty should do only the minimum required by law

39) Given the fact faculty members must be evaluated every two years, what evaluation scheme would you like to see for 1974-76? (1) present scheme (2) present scheme with minor modifications -- please specify (3) present scheme with major modifications -- please specify (4) new scheme -- please specify

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

Report of Certificated Staff Evaluation

Date _____

☐ Regular
☐ Contract
☐ Temporary
(Check one)

_____ _____

(Name of Staff Member) Department

This form is to be completed by the evaluator(s) in consultation with the staff member being evaluated. Relevent documents may be attached. All attached papers should be documented–signatures, dates, etc. Staff members are encouraged to seek evaluation information from as many sources as appropriate: self, peer, student, administrative, other. (Specify sources used.)

_____ _____

(Evaluator(s) signature) (Date)

STAFF MEMBER: I certify that this report has been discussed with me. I understand my signature does not necessarily indicate agreement.

Comment: _____

_____ _____

(Staff member's signature) (Date)

Received and reviewed by:

_____ _____

(Department Chairman/Director's signature) (Date)

_____ _____

(Dean's Signature) (Date)

_____ _____

(President's signature) (Date)

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

This sheet is for the purpose of explaining in writing some of your responses on the questionnaire. Please designate the number of the item to which you are responding.

Sample Data Computer Card

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DOW 18178-0

B.C. 16-1

MARK ANSWERS AS SHOWN IN THESE SAMPLES

X Y Z

DIRECTIONS: THE NUMBER OF EACH QUESTION IS FOLLOWED BY FOUR BUBBLES WITH NUMBERS AND FOUR WITH LETTERS. CHOOSE A NUMBERED WORD (1, 2, 3 or 4) FOR THE FIRST BLANK AND FILL IN THE BUBBLE THAT CONTAINS THAT NUMBER. CHOOSE A LETTERED WORD (A, B, C or D) FOR THE LAST BLANK AND FILL IN THE BUBBLE THAT CONTAINS THAT LETTER.

FILL TWO BUBBLES FOR EACH QUESTION. BE SURE THAT THESE BUBBLES ARE OPPOSITE THE NUMBER OF THE QUESTION YOU ARE ANSWERING. MAKE YOUR MARKS HEAVY AND BLACK. USE ONLY THE SPECIAL PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY ANY MARKS TO BE CHANGED.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

TURN CARD OVER AND CONTINUE ON OTHER SIDE

DOW 18178-0

(CONTINUED FROM OTHER SIDE)

DO NOT MAKE ANY EXTRA MARKS ON THE CARD. DO NOT MARK THE TEST BOOKLET. IGNORE THE HOLES PUNCHED IN THE CARD

FILL BUBBLES WITH HEAVY BLACK MARKS. USE ONLY THE SPECIAL PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY ANY MARKS TO BE CHANGED.

24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50

J00975

bakersfield college founded 1913

September 10, 1974

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Dave Scott, Greg Goodwin, Bob Allison

SUBJECT: Evaluation Assessment

It is the goal of the Academic Senate Evaluation Committee to get as close as possible to a 100% return on the evaluation assessment questionnaire sent to all faculty on August 27. If the faculty is to have a major input in designing an evaluation scheme for the next two years, it is imperative that all faculty members respond. If you have not yet returned the questionnaire, could you please do so within the next week?

If you have any questions concerning any of the items in the instrument, please ask either Greg Goodwin, Bob Allison or Dave Scott. If you never received your copy of the questionnaire or have misplaced the copy you received, extra copies are available from Shirley Holleyman, Institutional Research Secretary in the Administration Office.

Thanks for your help.

1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305 • tel: (805) 871-7120 • Kern Community College District

Bakersfield College founded 1913

September 20, 1974

TO: Department Chairpersons

FROM: Dave Scott, Greg Goodwin, Bob Allison

SUBJECT: Evaluation Assessment Questionnaire

On August 27, all faculty members received a copy of the Academic Senate designed Evaluation Assessment Questionnaire. As stated in the original covering letter, data from this study will be used to design an improved staff evaluation-development plan for the next two years. Data from the study will be computed for each department as well as for the college as a whole. These data will be made available to department chairpersons so that each department evaluation scheme can be properly assessed. Given this approach, it is essential that every member in a department return the completed questionnaire. Our records show the following members of your department have not yet returned the questionnaire:

Would you please ask them to do so as soon as possible so that we can get you your data?

Institutional research secretary Shirley Holleyman has extra evaluation questionnaires for those who have misplaced their first one. If there are any questions on the study, please feel free to ask Dave Scott, Greg Goodwin or Bob Allison

1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305 • tel: (805) 871-7120 • Kern Community College District

PART III

RESPONSES TO SURVEY ITEMS

On the pages that follow are the results of the responses to each of the items in the questionnaire. For those not wishing to plow through the figures, the statistical results are preceded by an analysis by the Evaluation Committee. The first page lists the number to respond in each department along with the code number of that department on the questionnaire. Many respondents were in more than one department; if this was the case, for computerization purposes they were assigned to the department where they spent the greater amount of teaching or counseling hours, so the list on page 22 only includes numbers and does not indicate percentage of individuals in each department to respond.

The actual questions began with number five. The total number and percentages of each response on each item are indicated. The right hand column indicates the total number to answer each survey item (the number used as the base for the percentage).

In reading the data, remember that possible responses varied from two to eight on each item. The numbering system on the existing response card used was 1-2-3-4-A-B-C-D rather than 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8.

Following is an example of how to read the data. Question number thirty-six on the role of the department chairman was as follows:

> "36. What role should a department chairman have in evaluation? (1) No role except to sign the evaluation summary and send it to administration. He should not be the one to summarize evaluation materials. (2) He should summarize evaluation materials without further judgment, sign, and send the summary to administration. (3) He should summarize the evaluation materials, including a minimal amount of his own opinion in the final result. (4) He should make the summary of evaluation materials reflect both his own judgment of the evaluation results and his personal evaluation of the faculty member. (A) He should be actively involved in the evaluation of each faculty member in his department."

Responses were designated as follows:

Item No.	Responses With Numbers and Percentages Marking Each								Total to Respond
	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D	
36	30	14	38	31	68	1			182
	16.48	7.69	20.88	17.03	37.36	.55			

Response No. 1 indicates that thirty people (16.48%) of those to answer this question felt the department chairman should take absolutely no role in evaluation. Response No. A (the fifth column) indicates that sixty-eight individuals (37.36%) saw an extremely active role for the department chairman. The number "1" (.55%) under "B" indicates one individual filled in the wrong space. The total percentage to choose responses 3, 4, and A was 75.27. Thus, about three-quarters of the respondents see the department chairman taking some significant role. However responses to this item may deviate from the all-college average when computed on a department by department basis. Clearly, there is a wide range of opinion on this item.

Following the results there is a tabulation of the written responses to numbers 7, 8, and 9 (questions on type of evaluation schemes used or preferred).

Summary of Results
By Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation

Some conclusions of the committee after reviewing the available data are these:

1. The return rate of 77.3% is very good and most departments are well represented.
2. A great deal of flexibility does exist in the evaluation plan, and that flexibility is highly valued by the faculty.
3. The purpose of evaluation for regular staff should be for the improvement of instruction; yet for contract staff the question of retention or dismissal should be also considered. (This is significant since present evaluation procedures treat regular and contract staff equally.)
4. Most faculty find evaluation moderately effective and beneficial and not threatening.
5. Many faculty members seem to spend more time and receive greater benefit from participating in the evaluation of others than themselves.
6. Most faculty feel the department chairman should be actively engaged in evaluation.
7. A large number of faculty did not receive a copy of their evaluation, although they should have.
8. Over 85% of respondents did not think that Bakersfield College should "try to do a complete and effective evaluation job, substantially exceeding legal requirements." (question #38)
9. Over 80% of the faculty wants to continue the present plan -- as is or with minor modifications. (question #39)

Department Responses

Card Code Number	Department	Number
1 - 1	Administrative	13
1 - 2	Agriculture	2
1 - 3	Art	6
1 - 4	Audio-Visual	2
1 - A	Business Ed	8
1 - B	Counseling	14
1 - C	Drama	2
1 - D	English	17
2 - 1	Foreign Language	5
2 - 2	Health and P.E.	18
2 - 3	Health Sciences	9
2 - 4	Home Ec	6
2 - A	Industrial Education	14
2 - B	Journalism	2
2 - C	Library	3
2 - D	Life Science	7
3 - 1	Math	9
3 - 2	Music	4
3 - 3	Nursing R.N.	3
3 - 4	Philosophy	2
3 - A	Physical Science	16
3 - B	Psychology	9
3 - C	Public Service	3
3 - D	Social Science	12
4 - 1	Sociology-Anthropology-Geography	6
4 - 2	Speech	2

RESULTS OF FALL 1974 EVALUATION SURVEY

(194 Faculty and Administrators Participating)

Survey Question Item	Responses With Numbers and Percentages Marking Each								Total to Respond to Each Item
	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D	
5	159 83.25	32 16.75							191
6	177 92.19	15 7.81							192
7	34 18.09	48 25.53	4 2.13	32 17.02	8 4.26	3 1.60	51 27.13	8 4.26	188
8	3 1.62	67 36.22	8 4.32	53 28.65	7 3.78	19 10.27	17 9.19	11 5.95	185
9	52 26.67	31 15.90	70 35.90	14 7.18	28 14.36				195
10	79 43.41	89 48.90	11 6.04	3 1.65					182
11	9 5.08	158 89.27	10 5.65						177
12	43 23.89	25 13.89	27 15.00	29 16.11	49 27.22	7 3.89			180
13	42 23.33	128 71.11	9 5.00	1 .56					180

Survey Question Item	Responses With Numbers and Percentages Marking Each								Total to Respond to Each Item
	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D	
14	59 31.22	116 61.38	12 6.35	2 1.06					189
15	153 80.53	28 14.74	3 1.58	6 3.16					190
16	22 12.36	56 31.46	64 35.96	25 14.04	11 6.18				178
17	95 53.98	38 21.59	14 7.95	28 15.91	1 .57				176
18	28 15.73	59 33.15	60 33.71	23 12.92	8 4.49				178
19	15 8.33	89 49.44	71 39.44	2 1.11	3 1.67				180
20	9 4.66	29 15.03	26 13.47	46 23.83	83 43.01				193
21	117 65.00	63 35.00							180
22	6 3.19	79 42.02	64 34.04	26 13.83	13 6.91				188
23	4 2.27	14 7.95	79 44.89	60 34.09	19 10.80				176

Survey Question Item	Responses With Numbers and Percentages Marking Each								Total to Respond to Each Item
	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D	
24	132 68.39	61 31.61							193
25	40 30.77	34 26.15	24 18.46	11 8.46	21 16.15				130
26	24 18.60	17 13.18	7 5.43	18 13.95	38 29.46	25 19.38			129
27	8 6.11	66 50.38	56 42.75		1 .76				131
28	9 6.87	79 60.31	41 31.30	2 1.53					131
29	14 7.65	21 11.48	132 72.13	9 4.92	7 3.83				183
30	117 66.10	58 32.77	2 1.13						177
31	51 68.92	22 29.73		1 1.35					74
32	39 55.71	31 44.29							70
33	11 15.49	59 83.10	1 1.41						71

Survey Question Item	Responses With Numbers and Percentages Marking Each								Total to Respond to Each Item
	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D	
34	27 39.71	41 60.29							68
35	31 17.32	36 20.11	61 34.08	36 20.11	14 7.82	1 .56			179
36	30 16.48	14 7.69	38 20.88	31 17.03	68 37.36	1 .55			182
37	110 63.58	63 36.42							173
38	23 12.17	94 49.74	72 38.10						189
39	113 63.13	33 18.44	16 8.94	16 8.94	1 .56				179

Responses to Questions
On Evaluation Schemes Used or Preferred

7. Choices "C" and "D" in this question asked respondents to list combinations of evaluation required by their department other than those indicated by responses 1, 2, 3, 4, A, B. The schemes listed by faculty members are:

	Number	Percent
Any two of the four schemes	12	32.4
Any three of four	7	18.9
Any combination of evaluatees choice	7	18.9
Any plan approved by department chairman	2	5.4
Self, peer, administrative	2	5.4
Three of four but including peers	1	2.7
Peer, self, student	1	2.7
Peer and self	1	2.7
Administrative, peer, self and classified	1	2.7
Student and department chairman	1	2.7
Peer, student, administrative	1	2.7
Self, administrative required; peer, student optional but encouraged	1	2.7
Peer and student	1	2.7
Self, student, administrative	1	2.7
Total	39	

8. Though thirty-nine schemes outside those listed on the questionnaire were reported by respondents as required, only seventeen schemes were

reported by respondents outside the patterns presented. These seventeen are:

	Number
Student, self, administrative	4
Peer, student, administrative	2
Any option	2
Administrative only	2
Peer and administrative	1
Department chairman, peer, student	1
Peer, self, student with administrative involvement desired	1
Self, administrative with peer encouraged	1
Peer, student, administrative, classified	1
Peer, self, student	1
Self, peer, administrative	1

9. Several respondents believe that no one of the four evaluation sources was the best. Many listed combinations as equally valuable. Some of these combinations are:

	Number
All four	5
Self and student equally	3
Peer and student	1
Administrative and department chairman	1
Combination of self, peer and administrative	1
Student, administrative, self	1
Student, peer, self	1
Self, peer, administrative	1

PART IV

WRITTEN RESPONSES

Faculty members were invited to make comments on their responses. Approximately half included some sort of written comment. About half of these (25% of the total) replied in some detail. Most of this detail emerged in response to questions 17 and 39. Analysis of these two items by the Academic Senate Committee is offered on the following page.

As indicated in the introduction, faculty members wishing copies of the written comments may pick up a set from the Office of Institutional Research. The committee decided that to include the written comments as a formal part of the report might make the report unduly long and might betray confidentiality.

Summary of Written Responses
By Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation

The following is a summary of the Senate committee's discussion of the written comments:

1. A large number of the respondents who bothered to write additional comment to the multiple-choice questionnaire were critical of evaluation program, viewing it as a state imposed program in the inept hands of administrators.

2. Question number 17 which asked the faculty what really was (not should be) the major purpose of evaluation, elicited the most hostile written comments. This is noteworthy since a majority of the faculty marked that the major purpose of evaluation was (1) "mostly for the improvement of instruction." Other responses were: (2) partly for the improvement of instruction and partly a grading process (22% marked No. 2); (3) mostly a grading process (7.7% marked No. 3); (4) other -- please specify (16.1% or 27 people marked No. 4). There were twenty-two written comments on question number 17, overwhelmingly expressing hostility toward the state law which mandated evaluation.

3. Question number 39 asked for written responses from faculty desiring even a minor modification from the present evaluation scheme. Sixty-three percent of the faculty marked (1) "present scheme" and presumably offered no written comments. Specifically requested to comment were the thirty-three people (18.4%) marking (2) "minor modifications"; the sixteen people (8.9%) marking

(3) "major modifications"; and (4) "new scheme," sixteen people (8.9%).

In all, forty written comments were made. This question seemed to elicit remarks from a different section of the faculty from that which responded in writing to question number 17 (see "2" above). Those desiring a tougher evaluation plan emerged here. The forty comments can be classified as follows:

Number of Responses	Type
13	Toughen plan up / Make it more uniform
7	Best evaluation source is . . . (answers varied)
6	Evaluation too structured
5	Specific suggestions (varied)
4	Let paid administrators do it
3	Takes too much time / Compensate with pay
2	Unclassifiable

4. The written responses represent mostly two minorities: one objecting to the state mandated evaluation; the other desiring an evaluation plan with more teeth. It should be remembered that most of the faculty did not offer written comments on the multiple-choice questionnaire and instead marked responses in favor of the status quo.

PART V

CONCLUSION

Later during the academic year the Evaluation Committee will make recommendations on evaluation procedure changes or modifications to the Academic Senate. The committee is currently analyzing responses to question number 36 (role of department chairman), and comparing responses between contract (non-tenured) and regular (tenured) employees to see if there is any difference in how they view evaluation.

Hopefully the data and comments that have been indicated in this study will result in an evaluation scheme which is regarded as improved by most members of the faculty.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 28 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION